



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,174	02/28/2002	Fernando Bolanos	10014354-1	2633

7590 12/02/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PAPANIKOLAOU, ATHANASIOS T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,174

Applicant(s)

BOLANOS, FERNANDO

Examiner

Athanasios Tom Papanikolaou

Art Unit

2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/28/02 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 18-19, 22-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,369,905 B1) in view of Hagiuda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,182,225 B1).

The methods and systems disclosed by the prior art do not disclose expressly being on a computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions. However, for the methods and systems to function, they would have to be implemented as computer executable instructions on a computer readable medium. Therefore, the prior art is inherently embodied as computer executable instructions on computer-readable mediums.

Regarding claim 1, Mitsuhashi discloses a **computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions configured to cause a computer to perform: receiving an event code** (column 13, lines 37-39, status information is broadly interpreted to include event codes); **based on the event code** (column 13,

lines 52-56), **receiving an image from each of one or more external devices attached to a printing system** (column 14, lines 30-34).

Mitsubishi does not disclose expressly **combining each image with a printing device image to create a system image; and displaying the system image on a control panel.**

Hagiuda discloses **combining each image with a printing device image to create a system image; and displaying the system image on a control panel** (see Fig. 55 and column 41, lines 49-52).

Mitsubishi and Hagiuda are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsubishi's method include combining each image with a printing device image to create a system image and displaying the system image on a control panel, as taught by Hagiuda. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsubishi's system could provide a user with a convenient visual display of the various components in a printing system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hagiuda with the method of Mitsubishi to obtain the invention in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Mitsubishi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, and Hagiuda further discloses **wherein the receiving an event code occurs during a printing process, the computer executable instructions being further configured to cause a computer to perform sending an instruction to halt the printing process** (column 49, lines 5-8).

Regarding claim 3, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the receiving an event code comprises receiving the event code from a printing device** (column 13, lines 37-39 and column 14, lines 20-21).

Regarding claim 4, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the receiving an event code comprises receiving the event code from an external device** (column 13, lines 30-33, updating a device image from a second information device; column 13, lines 52-56, a device image is changed in response to received status information from a device).

Regarding claim 5, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the receiving an image further comprises sending an instruction to the one or more external devices, the instruction defining the image based on the event code** (column 13, lines 45-47).

Regarding claim 7, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the control panel is located on the printing device** (column 6, lines 6-10 and column 6, lines 47-49).

Regarding claim 8, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, and Hagiuda further discloses **wherein the event code is an error code** (column 41, lines 49-58, an error code is inherently used to trigger a symbol mark indicating an error in the printer image display).

Regarding claim 18, Mitsuhashi discloses a **computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions configured to cause a computer to merge images on a control panel by performing: requesting an image from each of one or more external devices, each image being defined by the event code (column 13, lines 37-39 and column 13, lines 52-56); the printing device image being defined by the event code (column 14, 19-21 and column 13, lines 52-56).**

Mitsuhashi does not disclose expressly **during a printing process, sensing an event on a printing device, the event being associated with an event code; forming a system image from each image and a printing device image; and displaying the system image on a control panel.**

However, Hagiuda discloses **during a printing process, sensing an event on a printing device, the event being associated with an event code (column 49, lines 5-8); forming a system image from each image and a printing device image; and displaying the system image on a control panel (see Fig. 55 and column 41, lines 49-52).**

Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsuhashi's method include sensing an event, from an event code, during a printing process and forming a system image of the printer and additional components, as taught by Hagiuda. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsuhashi's system could display to a user a complete printing system image including which component has an

error . Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hagiuda with the method of Mitsuhashi to obtain the invention in claim 18.

Regarding claim 19, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 18, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the requesting further comprises: sending an instruction to the one or more external devices, the instruction defining each image based on the event code** (column 13, lines 45-47); **and receiving an image from each of the one or more external devices** (column 13, lines 52-56 and column 13, lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 22, Mitsuhashi discloses **a printer comprising: a control panel; a printer image** (column 2, lines 51-54).

Mitsuhashi does not disclose expressly **and a merge module configured to combine the printer image with one or more external device images to form a system image, and, to display the system image on the control panel.**

However, Hagiuda discloses **and a merge module configured to combine the printer image with one or more external device images to form a system image, and, to display the system image on the control panel** (see Fig. 55 and column 41, lines 49-52).

Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsuhashi's apparatus include a module to combine the printer image with one or more external device images to form a system image and display the system image on the control panel, as taught by

Hagiuda. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsuhashi's apparatus could display to a user a complete printing system image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hagiuda with the apparatus of Mitsuhashi to obtain the invention in claim 22.

Regarding claim 23, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 22, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the printer image and each external device image are determined from an event code** (column 14, lines 20-21 and column 13, lines 30-33 and column 13, lines 52-56).

Regarding claim 24, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 23, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the event code is generated in an external device** (column 13, lines 30-33, updating a device image from a second information device; column 13, lines 52-56, a device image is changed in response to received status information from a device (status information is broadly interpreted to include event codes); to receive status information/event codes from a device the device would have to generate them).

Regarding claim 26, Mitsuhashi discloses **a printer comprising: a control panel** (column 2, lines 51-54); **a plurality of printer images** (column 7, lines 42-45, to reflect the various settings of the virtual printer on the printer panel several printer images are needed) **and a merge module configured to receive external images from each of one or more external devices** (column 7, lines 20-22).

Mitsuhashi does not disclose expressly **form a system image from a printer image and an external image from each of the one or more external devices, and display the system image on the control panel.**

However, Hagiuda discloses **form a system image from a printer image and an external image from each of the one or more external devices, and display the system image on the control panel** (see Fig. 55 and column 41, lines 49-52).

Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsuhashi's apparatus include forming a sytem image with one or more external device images and display the system image on the control panel, as taught by Hagiuda. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsuhashi's apparatus could display to a user a complete printing sytem image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hagiuda with the apparatus of Mitsuhashi to obtain the invention in claim 26.

Regarding claim 27, Mitsuhashi discloses **a system comprising: a printing device having a control panel** (column 2, lines 51-54) **and printing device image** (column 7, lines 42-45, to reflect the settings of the virtual printer on the printer panel a printer image is needed); **one or more external devices, each external device having an external device image** (column 14, lines 30-34); **wherein the printing device comprises a merge module configured to retrieve the images** (column 13, lines 37-51).

Mitsubishi does not disclose expressly **combine the images into a system image, and display the system image on a control panel.**

However, Hagiuda discloses **combine the images into a system image, and display the system image on a control panel** (see Fig. 55 and column 41, lines 49-52).

Mitsubishi and Hagiuda are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsubishi's system include combining images into a system image and displaying the system image on a control panel, as taught by Hagiuda. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsubishi's system could display to a user a complete printing system image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hagiuda with the system of Mitsubishi to obtain the invention in claim 27.

Regarding claim 28, Mitsubishi discloses **a system comprising: a printing device having a control panel** (column 2, lines 51-54) **and an image of itself** (column 7, lines 42-45, to reflect the settings of the virtual printer on the printer panel, an image of the printer is needed in memory); **one or more external devices, each external device having an image of itself** (column 14, lines 30-34); **wherein the printing device comprises a merge module configured to interpret an event code, retrieve images based on the event code** (column 13, lines 52-56).

Mitsubishi does not disclose expressly **combine the images into a system image, and display the system image on a control panel.**

However, Hagiuda discloses **combine the images into a system image, and display the system image on a control panel** (see Fig. 55 and column 41, lines 49-52).

Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsuhashi's system include combining images into a system image and displaying the system image on a control panel, as taught by Hagiuda. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsuhashi's system could display to a user a complete printing system image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hagiuda with the system of Mitsuhashi to obtain the invention in claim 28.

3. Claims 6, 20, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhashi et al. in view of Hagiuda et al. and further in view of McCormick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,706,411).

Regarding claim 6, Mitsuhashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 1, as stated above, and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein the image and the printing device image are defined by the event code** (column 14, lines 20-21 and column 13, lines 30-33 and column 13, lines 52-56) **to include characteristics selected from a group of characteristics comprising: an angle of view; a distance of view** (column 7, lines 1-2, images of different angles and distances are necessary to provide various rotational images of a printer image).

Mitsubishi and Hagiuda do not disclose expressly **and an animated view**.

However, McCormick discloses **and an animated view** (column 9, lines 8-11).

Mitsubishi, Hagiuda, and McCormick are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsubishi and Hagiuda's system include an animated view, as taught by McCormick. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsubishi and Hagiuda's system could provide a user with an image simulating an action of the printing system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of McCormick with the system of Mitsubishi and Hagiuda to obtain the invention in claim 6.

Regarding claim 20, Mitsubishi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 18, as stated above, and Mitsubishi further discloses **wherein each image and the printing device image are defined by the event code to include characteristics selected from a group of characteristics comprising: an angle of view; a distance of view** (column 7, lines 1-2, images of different angles and distances are necessary to provide various rotational images of a printer image).

Mitsubishi and Hagiuda do not disclose expressly **and an animated view**.

However, McCormick discloses **and an animated view** (column 9, lines 8-11).

Mitsubishi, Hagiuda, and McCormick are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsubishi and Hagiuda's system include an animated view, as taught by McCormick. The

suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsushashi and Hagiuda's system could provide a user with an image simulating an action of the printing system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of McCormick with the system of Mitsushashi and Hagiuda to obtain the invention in claim 20.

Regarding claim 25, Mitsushashi and Hagiuda disclose the dependency of claim 22, as stated above, and Mitsushashi further discloses **wherein the printer image and each external device image illustrate views having particular characteristics selected from a group of characteristics comprising: an angle of view; a distance of view** (column 7, lines 1-2, images of different angles and distances are necessary to provide various rotational images of a printer image).

Mitsushashi and Hagiuda do not disclose expressly **and an animated view**.

However, McCormick discloses **and an animated view** (column 9, lines 8-11).

Mitsushashi, Hagiuda, and McCormick are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely printing and data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Mitsushashi and Hagiuda's apparatus include an animated view, as taught by McCormick. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Mitsushashi and Hagiuda's apparatus could provide a user with an image simulating an action of the printing system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of McCormick with the apparatus of Mitsushashi and Hagiuda to obtain the invention in claim 25.

4. Claims 10, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hagiuda in view of Mori et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0156869 A1).

The methods and systems disclosed by the prior art do not disclose expressly being on a computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions. However, for the methods and systems to function, they would have to be implemented as computer executable instructions on a computer readable medium. Therefore, the prior art is inherently embodied as computer executable instructions on computer-readable mediums.

Regarding claim 10, Hagiuda discloses a **computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions configured to cause a computer to perform: receiving an event code from an external device** (column 41, lines 49-52, for the printer design to change, a code would need to be received by the printer indicating additional input/output printing components); **based on the event code, combining some of the images with a printing device image to form a system image and displaying the system image on a control panel** (see Fig. 55).

Hagiuda does not disclose expressly **initializing a printing device; during the initializing, receiving images from one or more external devices.**

However, Mori discloses **initializing a printing device; during the initializing, receiving images from one or more external devices**

Hagiuda and Mori are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image data processing. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Hagiuda's system include initialinzing a printer and during the intialiaziton receiving images from external devices, as taught by Mori. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Hagiuda's system could automatically update the printer's memory with images of external devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Mori with the system of Hagiuda to obtain the invention in claim 10.

Regarding claim 13, Hagiuda and Mori disclose the dependency of claim 10, as stated above, and Hagiuda further discloses **wherein the receiving an event code occurs during a printing process, the method further comprising issuing an instruction to halt the printing process** (column 49, lines 5-8).

Regarding claim 16, Hagiuda and Mori disclose the dependency of claim 10, as stated above, and Hagiuda further discloses **wherein the event code is an error code** (column 41, lines 49-58, an error code is inherently used to trigger a symbol mark indicating an error in the printer image display).

5. Claims 11, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hagiuda in view of Mori and further in view of Mitsuhashi.

Regarding claim 11, Hagiuda and Mori disclose the dependency of claim 10, as stated above.

Hagiuda and Mori do not disclose expressly **wherein the receiving images comprises receiving a group of images from each of the one or more external devices**.

However, Mitsuhashi discloses **wherein the receiving images comprises receiving a group of images from each of the one or more external devices** (column 7, lines 20-22).

Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Hagiuda and Mori's system include receiving a group of images from each of the one or more external devices, as taught by Mitsuhashi. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Hagiuda's system could receive images of various perspectives and functions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Mitsuhashi with the system of Hagiuda and Mori to obtain the invention in claim 11.

Regarding claim 14, Hagiuda and Mori disclose the dependency of claim 10, as stated above.

Hagiuda and Mori do not disclose expressly **wherein the receiving images further comprises requesting the images and identification information from each of the one or more external devices**.

However, Mitsuhashi discloses **wherein the receiving images further comprises requesting the images and identification information from each of the one or more external devices** (column 13, lines 45-47).

Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Hagiuda and Mori's

system include requesting images and identification information from external devices, as taught by Mitsuhashi. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Hagiuda's system could receive images of external devices and combine them to create a system image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Mitsuhashi with the system of Hagiuda and Mori to obtain the invention in claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, Hagiuda and Mori disclose the dependency of claim 10, as stated above.

Hagiuda and Mori do not disclose expressly **wherein the control panel is located on the printing device**.

However, Mitsuhashi discloses **wherein the control panel is located on the printing device** (column 6, lines 6-10 and column 6, lines 47-49).

Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Hagiuda and Mori's system include a control panel on the printer, as taught by Mitsuhashi. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Hagiuda's system could display a system image on the printer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Mitsuhashi with the system of Hagiuda and Mori to obtain the invention in claim 15.

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hagiuda in view of Mori in view of Mitsuhashi and further in view of McCormick.

Regarding claim 12, Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi disclose the dependency of claim 11, as stated above and Mitsuhashi further discloses **wherein each group of images includes images comprising: images from various angles; images from various distances** (column 7, lines 1-2, images of different angles and distances are necessary to provide various rotational images of a printer image).

Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi do not disclose expressly **and images that are animated**.

However, McCormick discloses **and images that are animated** (column 9, lines 8-11).

Hagiuda, Mori, Mitsuhashi, and McCormick are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor namely image data processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi's system include images that are animated, as taught by McCormick. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been that Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi's system could provide a user with images simulating actions and functions of the printing system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of McCormick with the system of Hagiuda, Mori, and Mitsuhashi to obtain the invention in claim 12.

7. Claims 9, 17, and 21 recite identical features as claims 1, 10, and 18, respectively, except claims 9, 17, and 21 are method claims. Thus, arguments similar to

Art Unit: 2627

that presented above for claims 1, 10, and 18 are equally applicable to claims 9, 17, and 21.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Martin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,353,899 B1) discloses a fault management system for a multifunctional printing system.

Ward (U.S. Patent 6,658,603 B1) discloses a method and apparatus for generating and implementing error codes.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Athanasios Tom Papanikolaou whose telephone number is (571)272-7953. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Athanasios Papanikolaou

JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2622
